

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated January 14, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 14, 2004. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-18 and 26-33 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-18 and 26-33 remain pending following entry of this response.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-10, 12-16, 18, 26-27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gever et al (Gever)* (US 6,313,835 B1) in view of *Kanno et al (Kanno)* (US 6,526,424 B2). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Gever is directed to a method for simplified generation of web page components which include animation and respond differently at different times and/or to different users. (See, Col. 1, line 64-Col. 2, line 8). In *Gever*, a server provides a web site to which a user connects in order to create a dynamic web page component, which is displayed differently to visitors at different times. To create such components, the user selects from a plurality of basic animation sequences, one or more animation sequence to be displayed on the web page. The web site then displays the component according to the time of day at the geographic location of the visitor or the time of day at the geographic location of the user who created the page. Therefore, *Gever* is directed at creating web page components by choosing via a remote connection to a server at least one of a plurality of basic animation sequences and posting the web page component including the animation sequence to a web page. In contrast to *Gever*, at least one embodiment of the present invention is directed to configuring a browser program with different browser settings according to a predetermined time-value. For example, when a predetermined time-value is satisfied by a current time, the browser program is configured with the browser settings associated with the predetermined time-value. The different browser settings may include, for example, homepage network addresses, bookmark data, toolbar configurations, and visited network address data. The browser is configured with each of these browser settings, when the associated time-value is satisfied by the current time.

In the Office Action dated January 14, 2004, the Examiner concedes that configuration of a browser in the manner claimed is not taught, shown or suggested by Gever. However, the Examiner suggests that *Kanno* teaches configuring a browser program with a browser setting corresponding to a satisfied predetermined time-value and that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the browser setting configuration in *Gever* as taught by *Kanno*. As an initial matter, Applicants submit that, even assuming that the combination as proposed by the Examiner is proper, neither reference, alone or in combination, teaches, shows or suggests at least two predefined browser settings. Nor do the references teach, show or suggest at least two predefined time-based browser settings. Nor do the references teach, show or suggest at least two predefined time-based browser settings each having respective, different predetermined time values. Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable and allowance of the same is requested.

Further, the Examiner states that the motivation for the combination is that the resulting configuration would enable the bookmark to be automatically accessed a predetermined time, which the Examiner states would have improved the bookmark function. Respectfully, Applicants are unable to determine in what way, or for what purpose, the combination would enable a bookmark to be automatically accessed at a predetermined time. Further, even assuming such a function, it is unclear how this would improve the bookmark function of *Kanno*. *Kanno* teaches updating bookmarks when a bookmarked page is moved or updated. (See, col. 19, line 37 through col. 20, line 46.) This is accomplished through an automatic traveling unit 111g, which periodically navigates to each of the bookmarked sites to determine whether the web page at that site has been moved or updated. (*Id.*) Accordingly, automatically accessing a bookmark at a predetermined time would not improve the "bookmark function" of *Kanno*. Therefore, Applicants submit that no appropriate motivation is provided for the asserted combination. Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable and allowance of the same is requested.

Claims 8, 17 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gever* in view of *Kanno* in further view of *Huck* (US 5,970,230). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. *Gever* and *Kanno* have been discussed

and overcome above. Accordingly, on the basis of these two references alone, Applicants submit that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gever in view of Kanno in further view of Nielsen (US 6,510,461 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Gever and Kanno have been discussed and overcome above. Accordingly, on the basis of these two references alone, Applicants submit that the rejection should be withdrawn.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)